H3RKGREP 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 16 CR 781 (RJS) 4 V. 5 GARFIELD GREEN, 6 Defendant. 7 ----x 8 New York, N.Y. March 27, 2017 9 11:30 a.m. 10 Before: 11 HON. RICHARD J. SULLIVAN, 12 District Judge 13 14 APPEARANCES 15 JOON H. KIM, 16 Acting United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York 17 MARGARET GRAHAM Assistant United States Attorney 18 CESAR de CASTRO 19 Attorney for Defendant 20 21 22 23 24 25

1	(Case called)
2	THE COURT: Let's take appearances.
3	For the government?
4	MS. GRAHAM: Good morning, your Honor. Margaret
5	Graham, on behalf of the government.
6	THE COURT: Okay, Ms. Graham. Could you just file a
7	notice of appearance? This case is listed as Mr. DiMase and
8	only Mr. DiMase.
9	MS. GRAHAM: Yes, your Honor.
10	THE COURT: So I just want to make sure you're getting
11	credit, and, also, I know who to blame if stuff doesn't happen.
12	Okay?
13	MS. GRAHAM: Yes, your Honor.
14	THE COURT: Great. Thanks.
15	And for the defendant?
16	MR. de CASTRO: For Mr. Green, Cesar de Castro.
17	THE COURT: Good morning, Mr. de Castro.
18	And, Mr. Green, good morning to you.
19	We were, I think, all set to do this last week, and I
20	don't know what happened, there was some miscommunication, and
21	Mr. Green was not produced, but my understanding is that
22	Mr. Green wishes to plead guilty to Count Two of the indictment
23	pursuant to a plea agreement with the government.
24	Is that right?
25	MR. de CASTRO: That's true, Judge. If you recall the

other day, we scheduled this for 11:30 because I was coming directly from a presentence interview.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. de CASTRO: Thankfully, we did 11:30, because I just ran over here. Can I just take two more seconds? He just didn't sign the forfeiture agreement.

THE COURT: Take your time.

MR. de CASTRO: Then we'll be set.

THE COURT: Yes.

(Pause)

MR. de CASTRO: We're all set. Thank you for your patience, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

So, Mr. Green, as I understand it, you wish to plead guilty today. Is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Well, before I accept your guilty plea,
I'm going to ask you some questions here in court, and the
purpose of my questions is, first of all, to make sure that you
fully understand your rights. Okay?

THE DEFENDANT: Okay.

THE COURT: The second purpose of my questions is to make sure that you're pleading guilty because you are guilty and not for some other reason. Now, if at any point, you don't understand my questions, let me know. I'm happy to repeat or

rephrase the questions, no problem there.

If at any point you want to talk to Mr. de Castro before you answer a question, that's fine. I'll give you as much time as you need. I don't want you to feel rushed in any way.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay.

THE COURT: In a moment, though, I'm going to have you take an oath. I'm going to have you stand, and raise your right hand, and swear that you will truthfully answer my questions. Now, once you've taken that oath, if you were to make any false statements here in court, well, that would be a crime. That would be the crime of perjury. And I tell you that not to scare you, but just to make sure you understand, it's vitally important that you be completely truthful and thorough in all your answers to my questions. Okay?

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. Thank you.

THE COURT: Do you have any questions so far?

THE DEFENDANT: No.

THE COURT: No.

Okay. Well, let me ask you to stand and raise your right hand.

(Defendant sworn)

THE COURT: Could you tell me your full name?

THE DEFENDANT: Garfield J., as in Jamaica, Green.

THE COURT: Mr. Green, how old are you?

1	THE DEFENDANT: I'm 42.
2	THE COURT: How far did you go in school?
3	THE DEFENDANT: I finished high school.
4	THE COURT: Where was that?
5	THE DEFENDANT: In Jamaica.
6	THE COURT: In Jamaica, the Island of Jamaica?
7	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
8	THE COURT: Okay. Have you had any formal education
9	since then?
10	THE DEFENDANT: No.
11	THE COURT: You read and you write English, correct?
12	THE DEFENDANT: Yeah.
13	THE COURT: You obviously speak English.
14	Are you now, or have you recently been, under the care
15	of a doctor or a psychiatrist?
16	THE DEFENDANT: I've seen a psychiatrist since I got
17	here. Medical? I'm diabetic and stuff like that.
18	THE COURT: Let's break those down.
19	Let's talk about the psychiatrist. So, since you've
20	been here, you've seen a psychiatrist?
21	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
22	THE COURT: More than once or just once?
23	THE DEFENDANT: I think once.
24	THE COURT: Once? Okay.
25	Did the psychiatrist prescribe any medication for you?

1	THE DEFENDANT: No.
2	THE COURT: Do you have plans to follow up with the
3	psychiatrist in the future?
4	THE DEFENDANT: No.
5	THE COURT: No? Okay.
6	If I may ask, what was the reason for your meeting
7	with the psychiatrist when you met with him?
8	THE DEFENDANT: That's my first time being
9	incarcerated.
10	THE COURT: So it was part of the regular screening?
11	THE DEFENDANT: Yeah.
12	THE COURT: Oh, I see. Okay.
13	But you haven't followed up with him, and you have no
14	plans to; is that correct?
15	THE DEFENDANT: No.
16	THE COURT: Okay. And prior to that, prior to your
17	arrest in this case, have you had any kind of psychiatric
18	treatment, or seen a psychologist, or anything like that?
19	THE DEFENDANT: Like here when I lost my leg.
20	THE COURT: When you lost?
21	THE DEFENDANT: My leg.
22	THE COURT: Your leg?
23	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
24	THE COURT: When was that?
25	THE DEFENDANT: I think late '91.

T	THE COURT: Okay. And when was the last time you saw
2	a psychiatrist or a psychologist prior other than the prison
3	doctor?
4	THE DEFENDANT: That's it.
5	THE COURT: That was it?
6	THE DEFENDANT: When I lost my leg.
7	THE COURT: You also said that you've got some other
8	health issues. And you mentioned diabetes; is that right?
9	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
10	THE COURT: Do you take medication for diabetes?
11	THE DEFENDANT: Yeah. Insulin.
12	THE COURT: How often do you take insulin?
13	THE DEFENDANT: Two times a day.
14	THE COURT: That's by injection?
15	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
16	THE COURT: Does the insulin affect your judgment, or
17	your memory, or your ability to think clearly at all?
18	THE DEFENDANT: No, it doesn't. Just like probably
19	lowers sometimes, and if I don't take it, I get phantom pain.
20	THE COURT: Are you taking other medications besides
21	insulin?
22	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Metformin.
23	And I used to take painkillers for the phantom pain,
24	but I stopped taking it.
25	THE COURT: Because of your leg?

1	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
2	THE COURT: When was the last time you took medication
3	for that?
4	THE DEFENDANT: Probably a month ago.
5	THE COURT: A month ago? Okay.
6	In the past two days, have you taken any medication
7	besides insulin?
8	THE DEFENDANT: No.
9	THE COURT: In the past two days, have you drunk any
10	alcohol or taken any drugs of any kind?
11	THE DEFENDANT: No, never.
12	THE COURT: Okay. Is your mind clear today?
13	THE DEFENDANT: Yeah.
14	THE COURT: Do you understand the nature of this
15	proceeding and what's taking place here today?
16	THE DEFENDANT: I do, Judge.
17	THE COURT: Mr. de Castro, do you have any doubt as to
18	Mr. Green's mental competence or his ability to enter an
19	informed plea?
20	MR. de CASTRO: I have no doubts.
21	THE COURT: And, Ms. Graham, do you have any such
22	doubts?
23	MS. GRAHAM: No, your Honor.
24	THE COURT: All right. Neither do I. I don't know
25	Mr. Green well, but on the occasions that I have seen him, he

has struck me as very coherent, and intelligent, and aware of what's going on. His responses to my questions here today confirm that impression. And that, coupled with the statements of the lawyers, leads me to conclude that Mr. Green is fully competent to proceed with a guilty plea at this time.

So, Mr. Green, as I understand it, you wish to plead guilty to Count Two of the indictment in this case; is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you feel you have had enough time to discuss this case with your attorney, Mr. de Castro?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And you have had enough chance to discuss with him any possible defenses that you may have to the charges contained in this indictment?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes? Okay.

Are you satisfied with Mr. de Castro's representation of you?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: Okay. Well, what I want to do now is go over with you some rights that you have as a defendant in a criminal case, and I usually do that in two ways. One is by reviewing a document that you, hopefully, have seen called an Advice of Rights Form.

Τ	Do you have that, Mr. de Castro:
2	MR. de CASTRO: Yes. It's in front of him, Judge.
3	THE COURT: Great. Okay.
4	If you turn to the second page of that document,
5	Mr. Green, there's a signature page, there are some signatures
6	at the bottom of the page. Is one of those signatures yours?
7	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, it is.
8	THE COURT: And before you signed that document, did
9	you read it?
10	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did.
11	THE COURT: And you had a chance to discuss it with
12	Mr. de Castro before you signed?
13	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did, your Honor.
14	THE COURT: And he was able to answer any questions
15	you may have had about that document or the rights described in
16	that document?
17	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, he did.
18	THE COURT: And, Mr. de Castro, is that your signature
19	as well?
20	MR. de CASTRO: Yes, it is.
21	THE COURT: And before you signed it, you reviewed it
22	with your client?
23	MR. de CASTRO: Yes. I reviewed it with him last week
24	as well as again today.
25	THE COURT: Okay. Great.

If you could hand that up, I'll mark it as a court exhibit. I'll mark it as Court Exhibit 1. I'll date and initial it.

But in addition to this document, Mr. Green, I'm going to ask you some questions here in court that cover a lot of the same ground. I do that because these rights are so important, and your understanding of them is so essential, that I don't want to leave anything to chance.

THE DEFENDANT: All right.

THE COURT: So, as we go through these rights, if you have any questions about them, let me know.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay.

THE COURT: We're not in a hurry, we have plenty of time. We want do this very carefully and very thoughtfully.

Okay?

THE DEFENDANT: Okay. Thanks.

THE COURT: So, the first right that I want to go over with you is your right to a speedy and public trial by a jury on the charges contained in this indictment. Do you understand that you have that right?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: So, if there were a trial, the government would have the burden of proving that you were guilty beyond a reasonable doubt -- that would be the standard, beyond a reasonable doubt -- by competent evidence before you could be

25

1 found quilty. Do you understand that? 2 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: A jury of 12 citizens would have to agree 4 unanimously that you were guilty beyond a reasonable doubt 5 before you could be found quilty at trial. Do you understand that? 6 7 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 8 THE COURT: You would not have to prove that you were 9 innocent if you went to trial. Do you understand that? 10 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 11 THE COURT: You wouldn't have to prove anything. 12 could sit quietly and do nothing. The burden would always be 13 on the government to prove that you were guilty beyond a 14 reasonable doubt. Do you understand that? 15 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 16 THE COURT: Now, in this case, and at every stage of 17 this case, at all proceedings involved in this case, you are 18 entitled to have an attorney, and if you couldn't afford an 19 attorney, one would be appointed for you at no cost to you. Do 20 you understand that? 21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 22 THE COURT: And, so, in this case, Mr. de Castro has 23 been appointed to represent you; is that correct?

THE COURT: So, you're not paying him to be here,

Yeah.

THE DEFENDANT:

right?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And that's because Mr. de Castro is one of a group of lawyers that the Court has approved to represent individuals who can't otherwise afford an attorney. We're very fortunate. We have a lot of fantastic lawyers who are willing to do that work, and, in fact, we have to turn people away. And so, Mr. de Castro has been on that list for a long time.

How long have you been on it, Mr. de Castro?

MR. de CASTRO: Going on, I think, seven, eight years,

maybe.

THE COURT: Okay. So he's a very experienced lawyer who knows his way around federal court, and he's here to represent you at trial, or if you wish to plead guilty, then, obviously, we'll do that, but the point is, he's here to represent you no matter what. Do you understand that?

THE COURT: Now, if there were a trial in this case, the government would have to have its witnesses come into court, and they'd have to testify here in your presence. Do

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

you understand that?

THE COURT: That's because you have the right to confront your accusers. That's what the Constitution says.

And so that means that all the witnesses for the government

would have to come and testify right here, in this witness box, if there were a trial. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And that way, you would be able to see them and to hear them as they testify. You'd also have the right to have your attorney cross-examine those witnesses, to ask them questions, to see whether they knew what they were talking about, whether they were lying, whether they were perhaps mistaken. All of those things your lawyer could do by asking questions.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Your lawyer, Mr. de Castro, if there were a trial, could also object to the government's evidence if he thought there was some legitimate reason to keep the evidence out of the trial. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, you yourself could call witnesses, and you could present evidence if you wanted to. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: You'd have the right to do that. You wouldn't have to. As I said before, you have no obligation to do anything. But if you wanted to put on a case, and call witnesses and introduce evidence, that would be your right. Do

you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, if there were witnesses that you wanted to call, you wanted them to come to court and testify on your behalf, and they said, not a chance, I'm not coming to court, I don't want to be in court, I won't go, well, that wouldn't be the end of the story, because you could have subpoenas issued or other process used to compel those people to come to court and to testify truthfully under oath.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: You yourself could testify at trial if you wanted to. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: You'd have the right to get up here and testify just like any other witness. But you'd also have the right not to testify, and if you chose not to testify, the jury couldn't attach any significance to that fact. They couldn't say, well, this guy Green must be guilty because an innocent person would have gotten up here and told us his side of the story, and since he didn't do that, well, we know he must be guilty. They're not allowed to do that. And so I would tell the jury, as I do at every trial, both at the beginning of the trial and again at the end of the trial, I would remind them that the defendant is presumed innocent. I would remind them

that the burden of proof is on the government, and I would remind them that if the defendant chooses not to testify, you, the jury, I would say, can't hold that against him, you can't treat that as evidence as it's not evidence of anything.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, if the jury returned a guilty verdict against you at trial, you then would have the right to appeal the jury's verdict. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And that means that you could go to the Court of Appeals, which sits upstairs in this building, and you could challenge the jury's verdict or my rulings, and you could ask the Court of Appeals to either overturn the jury's guilty verdict or to give you a new trial perhaps. You'd have the right to appeal. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Even now, Mr. Green, as you're getting ready to enter a guilty plea, you have the right to change your mind. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: We haven't yet crossed the point of no return. We're getting pretty close, but if you told me right now, hey, I've changed my mind, I'd like to go to trial, that would be okay, I wouldn't be mad at you, Mr. de Castro wouldn't

be mad at you, Ms. Graham wouldn't be mad at you. We all understand this is your decision, and if you wish to go to trial, we respect that, and we'll go to trial. I think we have a date already. So, that's an option. If that's what you'd like to do, we can to that.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you still want to go forward with a guilty plea today?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that if you plead guilty, and if I accept your guilty plea today, that means that there will be no trial in this case? Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: By pleading guilty today, you will have given up your right to a trial and all the other rights that I just mentioned. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: I guess the only exceptions to that are your right to counsel will continue. Mr. de Castro will continue to represent you even if you plead guilty today, so you won't give up that right.

And you may also have the right to an appeal, though the reality is that once you plead guilty, and once I accept your guilty plea, it would be very difficult for you to appeal

and say, hey, I didn't do the things that I admitted to doing in court. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Now, you should also understand that as a result of your guilty plea, that means that you will be sentenced. Not today, but ultimately you will be sentenced on the basis of the crime that you pled guilty to. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And you should also understand that by pleading guilty — or let me put it this way: Before I accept your guilty plea, I'm going to ask you to tell me what it is you did that makes you guilty of this crime. The reason I do that is, I want to be very sure that you're pleading guilty because you are guilty and not for some other reason. But in asking you to tell me what you did that makes you guilty of the crime, I'm also asking you to give up another very important right, and that's your right not to incriminate yourself. As I said before, nobody can make you testify, nobody can make you speak to the government or even here in court, but if you want to plead guilty, I'm going to need you to tell me what you did so that I can be confident that you're pleading guilty for the right reasons.

Okay? Are you prepared to do that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. All right.

So let's talk a little bit about the charges in this case and the plea agreement. So, you've seen a copy of the indictment in this case?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: The indictment has two counts, but in this case, we're really going to be focused on the second count, which charges you with robbery. It's sometimes referred to as Hobbs Act, and Hobbs is just the name of the statute, the bill that became a law. It's a Hobbs Act robbery, and that means it's a federal robbery, a robbery that took place that affected interstate commerce. That's what makes it a federal crime as opposed to a state crime. So, that's what you've been charged with, and that's a crime that's in violation of a statute that was passed by Congress and signed by the president a long time ago, and if you looked to find it in the law books, it's Title 18 of the United States Code, Section 1951 and Section 2, also. So, that's what you have been charged with.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, every crime is made up of what are called elements. The elements are just kind of requirements. They're the building blocks of the offense. So, before you can be found guilty of this crime, the government would have to prove each and every one of the elements of the crime beyond a

reasonable doubt.

So, the elements — they can sound a little technical, but they're straightforward. These are the things I'd be asking the jury to consider and determine at trial, and these are the things that I will be considering today before I accept the guilty plea. They're called the elements, and I want you to listen carefully as I state what these elements are.

Actually, I'll let Ms. Graham do something, so she's going to tell us what the elements of this crime are. I want you to listen carefully to her. When she's finished, if you have any questions about these elements, let me know, and we can chat about it.

Okay. Ms. Graham.

MS. GRAHAM: This crime has three elements: First, that the defendant knowingly obtained or took the personal property of another or from the presence of another; second, that the defendant took this property against the victim's will by actual or threatened force, violence or fear of injury, whether immediately or in the future; and, third, that as a result of the defendant's actions, interstate commerce or an item moving in interstate commerce was delayed, obstructed, or affected in any way or degree.

THE COURT: Okay. So, it sounds a little technical, but it's basically pretty straightforward. Do you have any questions about what Ms. Graham just said? Do you understand?

Do you want me --

THE DEFENDANT: I don't understand.

THE COURT: You don't understand. Okay.

So, basically, to be found guilty of this crime, you have to have used or attempted to use force in order to take property from the person of another, and that force and that robbery has to have had an impact on interstate commerce. So, if you robbed a drug dealer, well, that would automatically affect interstate commerce because the drug trade affects the national economy, interstate economy. If you rob somebody as they were driving from one place to another or they were engaged in business that involved more than one state, that would be enough to affect interstate commerce.

Now, you don't have to have known about the interstate commerce part, but the government would have to prove that the robbery had an effect or could have an effect on interstate commerce. Okay?

THE DEFENDANT: Right.

THE COURT: And you have to have understood — but you would have to have understood that what you were doing was wrong and illegal. You don't have to know the specific statute, but you had to have a sense at the time you were doing it that this was not allowed. So, those are the elements.

Okay?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand.

THE COURT: I want you to ask me questions if you're not sure of anything.

Now, one other thing the government would have to establish, if this case went to trial, is that some part of this crime took place here in this district. This district is the Southern District of New York, and the Southern District of New York is comprised of Manhattan, the Bronx, Westchester, Rockland, Dutchess, Putnam, a few other counties up there. So, some part of this crime would have to have taken place in this district for you to be found guilty. If it all took place in California, you couldn't be found guilty here.

However, this requirement, which is sometimes referred to as venue, doesn't have to be proven beyond a reasonable doubt, the way the other elements do. This venue requirement would simply have to be proven by what's called a preponderance of the evidence, which is a much lower standard, just the greater weight of the evidence would be enough. Beyond a reasonable doubt would mean the scales of justice would have to just really be imbalanced, but preponderance is just ever so slightly in favor of proving that something happened here.

Now, in this cases, it sounds like you have agreed that you would waive the venue requirement, and that's allowed. So, if everything took place outside of this district, it all took place in New Jersey, perhaps, or in Queens, you could still be prosecuted here if you agree to waive this venue

requirement, and so that is my understanding, is that perhaps that's what you've contemplated here. We'll talk more about that, but those are the elements, and that's venue.

Do you have any questions about those things?
THE DEFENDANT: No. Thanks.

THE COURT: Okay. Good.

So let me tell you a little bit about the penalties that you face for this crime. This crime carries a maximum term of imprisonment of 20 years. It also carries a maximum term of supervised release of three years, which means that after you finished serving your prison term, you would be released, you'd come home, but you'd still be supervised by the probation office for up to three years. And that supervision would also carry with it certain terms and conditions that you'd have to comply with. So that's what supervised release is.

In addition, this crime also carries a maximum fine of the greatest of either \$250,000, twice the gross gain, financial gain, that was derived from this crime, or twice the gross loss that was experienced by someone else besides yourself as a result of this crime. So, whichever of those three options is the greatest, that's the maximum fine.

In addition, I can also order that you pay restitution to any person or entity that was harmed. So, if somebody got shot, for example, or somebody got injured, I could order you

to pay that person to help compensate them for those injuries.

And that's separate from a fine.

I can also order you to forfeit any of the property or the proceeds that were derived from this crime. So, whatever money you made or whatever money was made off of this crime, I could order you to pay it back, even if you don't have it still or even if it didn't all come to you, some of it went to coconspirators. The goal of this forfeiture is to make sure that people don't profit from crime, and so that's also part of a possible sentence.

I can also order you to forfeit any property that was used to carry out the crime. So, for example, if you engaged in this robbery, and you used a car for some part of the crime, I could order you to forfeit the car because the car was used to carry out the crime, and, therefore, it can be taken from you as part of forfeiture.

Finally, there is a \$100 special assessment that's mandatory that has to be paid, and that's, again, separate from any fine or any restitution or any forfeiture. The special assessment is designed to help cover the costs of the court --

THE DEFENDANT: All right.

THE COURT: -- of court reporters, and marshals, and law clerks, and judges, and all the things that are required to keep a system of justice running. Okay?

THE DEFENDANT: Okay.

1	THE COURT: So, those are the maximum penalties.
2	Do you have any questions about any of those?
3	THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.
4	THE COURT: Are you a United States citizen?
5	THE DEFENDANT: I'm sorry?
6	THE COURT: Are you a United States citizen?
7	THE DEFENDANT: No, I'm not.
8	THE COURT: You're not?
9	So, you should understand that as a consequence of
10	your guilty plea, it is at least possible, perhaps even likely,
11	that you would be deported back to is Jamaica your nation of
12	citizenship?
13	THE DEFENDANT: Yeah.
14	THE COURT: So it's possible that you would be
15	deported back to Jamaica as a result of this crime. Do you
16	understand that?
17	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.
18	THE COURT: You do understand that?
19	That won't be up to me.
20	THE INTERPRETER: Right.
21	THE COURT: That will be up to the executive branch,
22	the Department of Homeland Security will decide that. And
23	there might be things you can do to challenge that that won't
24	be decided by me, but that there's at least a good chance that
25	you would be deported as a result of this conviction, and I

want to make sure that you understand that.

So, you do understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay. I mentioned before that there is supervised release that's part of this crime, and the way supervised release works is that if you were to violate any of the terms and conditions of your supervised release, I could then resentence you to jail, I could send you back to jail for up to three years. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: You wouldn't get credit for any of the time you'd already spent on supervised release. So, if you're on for two years and doing great, and then in the last year of a three-year term, you committed another crime, or you used drugs, or possessed a gun or something, I could then say, that's it, I'm revoking supervised release, and I'm sending you back to jail for three years, and you wouldn't get credit for the two years you'd already spent on supervised release.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

Is supervised release allowing me go to work, though?

THE COURT: Oh, yes, supervised release would

typically be that you would be home, and working, and living,

24 and with your family.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay.

THE COURT: Now, because you might be deported, it might be that supervised release is not really going to apply, I don't know, but certainly supervised release is part of a sentence that I could impose. And even if you're deported, then if you ever returned, you'd have to immediately report to the probation office. Okay?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: Now, I should also mention to you that there's no parole in the federal system. New York State, New Jersey, some other states have parole. Jamaica may, too, other countries have parole, and the way parole works is that the judge might impose a particular sentence on the day of sentencing, but later, while the person was serving the sentence, the parole board might decide, okay, this person is ready to go home sooner than what the judge imposed, maybe half, maybe a third. Different states do it different ways. That's not part of the federal system. This is federal court, and, here, whatever sentence I impose on you, that is the sentence that you will serve.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: The only exception is that you could get a certain amount of time off, a small amount of time off, for good behavior, but that amount of time off could not be more than 15 percent of the total sentence. So, that's the maximum

amount reduction, would be 15 percent. And the decision as to whether you demonstrated good behavior, that would be up to the Bureau of Prisons, it wouldn't be up to me. But, otherwise, you'd have to serve the whole sentence that I impose.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, are you serving any other sentence at this point, state, federal, or any other sentence any place else?

THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, a couple of other things about sentencing that I want to make sure you understand.

First of all, the decision as to what you will receive is up to me and nobody else.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay.

THE COURT: So, no matter what anybody else has told you — whether it's your lawyer, or the government, or anybody else — I'm not bound by that. As I sit here now, I don't know what sentence I will impose, but I'm the only one who ultimately will decide that question. So, to the extent anybody has told you what I am likely to do, don't count on that. They don't know what they're talking about because I'm the only one who knows, and I'm the only one who has authority to decide. Okay?

THE DEFENDANT: Okay.

THE COURT: Now, there are certain factors that I'm required to consider when I decide what's an appropriate sentence. I want to just let you know what those factors are, so you have a sense as to how the process works. As I said, I'm not going to sentence you today, I'm going to sentence you a few months from now, when I have more information, but among the things I will carefully consider in deciding what's an appropriate sentence is, first of all, your own personal history.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay.

THE COURT: So I'm going to make sure that the sentence I impose is tailored to you as a person. That means looking at your entire life, from your birth right up until now. And I will consider the circumstances of your birth — were you born into tough economic circumstances, did you have a strong family structure or a weak family structure, did you have opportunities for education, do you have a work history of working legitimate jobs, do you have a prior criminal history — because all of that is relevant to determining what's an appropriate sentence. Your family circumstances today, all of that is relevant. I'll look at all of that, because the sentence is not just about the crime, it's also about you. So I'm going to look at the entire experience that you have had right up until now.

Now, another factor that I have to consider involves

the facts and circumstances of this crime. This is obviously a pretty serious crime. And so the sentence I impose has to reflect the seriousness of the crime. It has to promote respect for the law. It also has to provide a just punishment for this crime. So, that requires me to look at what exactly went on here, not just what the crime is called, but what exactly happened, what you did, what others did, what harm was caused, how much money was made, did this go on over a long period of time, was it a short thing. All of that matters in deciding what's an appropriate sentence. And so that's another factor that I will consider.

A third factor that I will consider is the need to deter or discourage you and others from committing crimes like this in the future. That's the hope, that by imposing a sentence on you in this case, I will send a message to you, and perhaps to other people, and that that message will encourage you to change your behavior, that it will have an impact on your future behavior and the future behavior of other people.

Now, I don't have a crystal ball, so it's hard for me to know with certainty what impact my sentence will have on anybody's future behavior, but I have to use my best judgment. I have to say, well, I think a sentence of this long is likely to send the message, and hopefully that message will sink in and will affect the way you conduct yourself in the future and the way potentially other people will conduct themselves in the

future. So, that's the hope, and that's another factor that I have to consider.

Another factor that I have to consider involves your own needs while you're in custody. So, obviously, you have some serious health issues, which a lot of defendants don't have. I have to make sure that those issues are addressed.

Not everybody has health issues. Some people have substance abuse treatment issues or mental health treatment needs. Some, frankly, just have the need for job training or educational opportunities. So I have to look at very carefully to see what your needs are and to make sure those needs are met and addressed while you're in custody. So, that's another factor I have to consider.

Another factor that I have to consider -- there are a lot of factors, as you can probably tell -- but another factor is something called the United States Sentencing Guidelines.

Are you familiar with the sentencing guidelines? Have you heard of those before, Mr. Green?

THE DEFENDANT: Not really.

THE COURT: You know, I have a hunch you probably did.

Mr. de Castro has probably --

THE DEFENDANT: Oh, yeah. Sorry, sorry, sorry.

THE COURT: Oh, no, no.

THE DEFENDANT: Sorry, he did told me.

THE COURT: That's okay. Look, today is an important

day in your life, and it's a little stressful. Probably I'm asking you a lot of questions, and, you know, you're hearing some of it, and some of it, you may not be hearing. That's why I go slow. That's why I make sure if you have any questions, you get to ask them. And it's why I'm watching and paying attention, right, I'm looking to see if you're hesitating, or if you look confused, then I know, well, maybe there's a need for a follow-up.

So, that's why we do it this way. We want to be really careful. So I have a feeling Mr. de Castro probably told you something about this because I know he's a very thorough lawyer, but whether he did or he didn't, I always explain a little bit about how the guidelines work, just for you and then for family members, too. Okay?

THE DEFENDANT: All right.

THE COURT: So, the guidelines are a big book, and there's a version that gets sent out every year. Usually in November, they put out a new version. It changes a little, sometimes more than others, from year to year, but it's like 500 pages, like almost 600 pages, so it's a long book, and it's a book that's prepared by a commission — it's called the United States Sentencing Commission — and that commission includes some judges, some lawyers, some law professors, some experts in the field of criminal law. And this book is designed to give guidance to judges like me who have to impose

sentences.

So, the way it works is that every crime or type of crime is covered by a chapter in this book. So, for a case like this one, involving robbery, I would go to the chapter that relates to robbery. And once I'm in that chapter, I'm directed to make certain findings. So, I'll make a finding about whether guns were used, whether anybody was harmed, how much money was taken, and depending on the answers to those questions, I am directed to assign points, and it's a process of basically adding and subtracting points. And at the end of that process, I come up with a number, or a total, and that total is referred to as the offense level.

I then go to another chapter in this book that relates to what's called criminal history. And not surprisingly, people who have prior convictions, people who have gone to prison before, well, they're more likely than not going to be treated more harshly than people who have no prior convictions. And so I go to the chapter on criminal history, and I am again directed to make findings about whether there were prior convictions, if so, when they were, if so, for how long the sentence was imposed, and depending on the answers to those questions, I, again, assign points, I total those, and I come up with another number. That number is referred to as the criminal history category. There are six criminal history categories. Category I is the lowest and least serious,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

category VI is the highest and most serious.

Then with those two numbers that I have told you about, the offense level on the one hand, the criminal history category on the other, I then go to the back of this book where there's a grade or a table, and I don't know how good your eyesight is, it's probably hard to see, but it's a chart, basically, and it's got a bunch of columns and rows, and on the far left-hand column, it says at the top "Offense Level," and that column goes down, it's numbered from 1 through 43. So, I will, on the day of sentencing, go down that column, and I'll keep going till I get to the number that I found to be the offense level in this case. I'll then go across these other columns, which are the criminal history categories, one for each criminal history category, and I will keep going until I reach the criminal history category that I found to be the appropriate one in this case. And where my finger finally rests in that process, well, that would be the range that in the view of the commission that wrote this book would be appropriate. And the range is set forth in terms of months. So, I'll go through that process, and I will then announce the range.

Now, I'm not required to follow this book -- I'm free to sentence above or below the range that's in this book -- but I do have to make my findings under the book, I have to consider it, I have to make my findings, and I have to announce

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the range, because that's one of the factors that I have to consider. Okay?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: And then, finally, the last factor that I have to balance, along with all the others I've mentioned, is what's sometimes referred to as the need to avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities between similarly situated people.

Now, what does that mean? Well, what it means, basically, I think, is this: Before imposing a sentence on you in this case, I really have to take a step back and make sure that the sentence I'm imposing here is roughly consistent with sentences imposed in other cases involving defendants who are similarly -- who have similar histories who engage in similar conduct. And that's because it would be wrong, I think, if you had people who were very similar, who engaged in similar crime, had similar criminal histories, and, yet, some of them did the top, they really got clobbered, and others did almost nothing simply because there were different judges involved or different lawyers involved. That would look arbitrary, and it would probably promote disrespect for the law, and so judges are told that we need to make sure that the sentences are consistent where the cases and individuals are similar, recognizing no cases are exactly alike, but where there are similarities, then those similarities should be reflected in the sentences imposed. Okay?

So, do you have any questions about any of those factors that I just mentioned?

THE DEFENDANT: No. I think I got it.

THE COURT: So, my job at sentencing will be to balance those things out because some of them might argue for a pretty tough sentence, while others might argue, hey, this guy deserves a break, and, so, my job will be to balance that. And it's sometimes a very difficult thing, and sometimes it's more art than science. It's not simply plugging in numbers on a calculator. But that will be the process that I engage in. Okay?

THE DEFENDANT: All right.

THE COURT: All right.

Now, let me make it clear to you, however, that if you were to be unhappy with the sentence that I impose, you were to think, wow, this guy gave me a sentence that I think is a lot higher than I was expecting and is a lot higher than what I think is fair, you certainly would be entitled to your opinion, and you might even be entitled to appeal up to the Court of Appeals to say I got it wrong, but you wouldn't be able to say, hey, I want my guilty plea back, I want to be able to go to trial, I want a do-over. That will not happen.

Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: I said before that we had not yet crossed

the point of no return, but we were getting pretty close. Once you've entered your guilty plea, and once I've accepted it, then ordinarily it's very difficult, if not impossible, to get it back, okay? And certainly, if you waited until the time of sentencing to say, wow, this guy Sullivan is a nut, that would be way too late. Okay?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

Now, I understand there's a plea agreement in this case. I've seen a draft of it. What I have is a letter dated March 13th. It's addressed to Mr. de Castro from Christopher DiMase, who's the other prosecutor on this case. It's a six-page single-spaced document.

Do you have that in front of you there, Mr. de Castro?

MR. de CASTRO: I do, your Honor.

THE COURT: If you could just put it in front of Mr. Green.

Sometimes there are multiple originals of these kicking around, which is fine, but I think we'll use the one in front of Mr. Green as the original that becomes a court exhibit. So, Mr. Green, if you could turn to the last page, there's a signature line at the bottom. Is that your signature?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, it is.

THE COURT: Okay. And before you signed this

1	document, did you read it?
2	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor, I did.
3	THE COURT: And before you signed it, did you discuss
4	it with Mr. de Castro?
5	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did, your Honor.
6	THE COURT: And you feel you had enough time to
7	discuss it with him?
8	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did.
9	THE COURT: And you had a chance to ask him any
10	questions that you may have had about this document?
11	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
12	THE COURT: Okay. And, Mr. de Castro, is that your
13	signature underneath Mr. Green's?
14	MR. de CASTRO: That's correct, Judge.
15	THE COURT: Before you signed it, you reviewed it with
16	your client?
17	MR. de CASTRO: Yes.
18	THE COURT: And you were able to answer any questions
19	he may have had about this document or the consequences of
20	signing this document?
21	MR. de CASTRO: Yes, I was.
22	THE COURT: Great.
23	If you could hand that up, I'll mark that as Court
24	Exhibit 2, I'll date and initial it. I generally give the
25	original back to the government, so I'm sure that the

government can give you a separate original, just so you've got your own version for your files, but, this way, if there's ever any question as to what was the document we were referring to here in court, it will be obvious this is the one since it has my initials, today's date, and Court Exhibit 2 at the top.

Mr. Green, I'm not going to go over this in tremendous detail. It's a six-page, single-spaced document. My goodness, it's not as long as this book, but it's pretty long and pretty detailed, but there are a couple of features about it I want to make sure that you understand.

First of all, this is an agreement between you and the government. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: So, you have certain obligations under this agreement, and so does the government. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: But I don't have any obligations under this agreement. I didn't sign it, I didn't negotiate it, and I'm not bound by it. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: So there may be some things in here that you and the government agree on that I say, you know what, I can't agree to that, I disagree. I don't know that that will happen, but sometimes, occasionally, it does, and if it does,

then I have an obligation to follow my own judgment, okay?

Even if you and the government agreed to something different.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, part of this agreement that I want to make sure you are aware of is that you and the government have stipulated, or you've agreed, to what the sentencing guidelines are in this case, how this book applies in this case. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: So, according to this agreement, you and the government both agree that the offense level is 25, and that the criminal history category is category I, and based on that offense level and that criminal history category, that results in a sentencing range of 57 to 71 months. So, 57 months is a little bit less than five years, and 71 months is a little bit less than six years. So, that's the range, according to this book, according to how you and the government have calculated the book to apply in this case.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Again, I may reach a different determination. I may conclude that the book comes out differently, it comes out higher or lower, and if that's the case, I have to follow my own judgment. Do you understand?

1 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Now, you're still free to argue for a 2 3 sentence below this range, but if I sentence you within that 4 range or below that range, you agree that you won't appeal the sentence. Do you understand that? 5 6 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 7 THE COURT: So, you may be hoping for something much lower than this guidelines range, but if I sentence you to 71 8 9 months or anything less than 71 months, even if you're 10 disappointed, it means, according to this agreement, that you 11 will not appeal. You give up that right as part of this 12 agreement. Do you understand that? 13 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Now, is there any other agreement besides 15 this one that exists between you and the government? THE DEFENDANT: That's the only agreement. 16 17 THE COURT: That's the only one? Okay. 18 Has anything been left out of this agreement? 19 THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor. 20 THE COURT: Are there any other side agreements that 21 you have with the government, either written or orally, that 2.2 aren't included in this document? 23 THE DEFENDANT: No. No, your Honor. 24 Okay. No, your Honor. 25 THE COURT: Okay. Has anybody threatened you in order

25

to get you to sign this document or to plead guilty here today? 1 2 THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Has anybody offered you anything of value 4 in exchange for signing this document or pleading guilty here 5 today? 6 THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Has anybody promised you what your 8 sentence will be? 9 THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: I guess there is also a forfeiture 11 component to this agreement. Do you have the forfeiture there? 12 Let's put that in front of Mr. Green. 13 So, Mr. Green, this plea agreement also includes a reference to you forfeiting certain money, certain proceeds, 14 15 from this crime. Do you understand that? 16 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 17 THE COURT: And, so, in addition to this agreement, 18 then, I was provided with what's called a consent preliminary 19 order of forfeiture/money judgment. 20 THE DEFENDANT: Yeah. 21 THE COURT: It's a five-page document, it has eight 22 numbered paragraphs, with a bunch of whereas clauses at the 23 Do you have that in front of you there? 24 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: If you turn to the last page, there is,

1	once again, a series of signature lines. Is one of those
2	has your name under it. Did you sign that document?
3	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did, your Honor.
4	THE COURT: Before you signed it, did you read it?
5	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
6	THE COURT: And you discussed it with Mr. de Castro?
7	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
8	THE COURT: And you had enough time to go over with
9	him any questions you may have had about this document and what
10	it means?
11	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
12	THE COURT: And, Mr. de Castro, that's your signature
13	below Mr. Green's?
14	MR. de CASTRO: Yes, it is.
15	THE COURT: And you know the drill. I guess I'm
16	getting like a broken record, but it is important. So, before
17	you signed this document, you reviewed it with your client?
18	MR. de CASTRO: Yes.
19	THE COURT: And answered any questions he may have
20	had?
21	MR. de CASTRO: Yes.
22	THE COURT: Okay.
23	If you could hand that up to me. And you're getting a
24	lot of exercise, but it's good for you.
25	MR. de CASTRO: It's good.

THE COURT: This is one I'm being asked to sign as well, so I will read it more carefully, and then I presumably will sign it and docket it. But I want to make sure everybody agrees. There's a blank on page 2: "Whereas on or about," blank, "2017, defendant pleaded guilty." I assume that's today's date, right?

MR. de CASTRO: Yes.

THE COURT: I'm going to insert today's date. We haven't yet finished this, but we're close.

What it says is that the money judgment, the forfeiture amount in this case, is \$252,000, and that as a result of this judgment, this order being entered, that you will owe that much money as forfeiture. Do you understand that, Mr. Green?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And I think it will be joint and several with your coconspirator, Mr. Clark, and if you can't -- but if he can't pay anything because he's broke, and you win the lottery or you, when you get out, have access to more money because you're working, then it may be that you have to pay it all. That's just the way it goes. Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

So it's up to \$252,000, plus interest, right,
Ms. Graham? Ms. Graham, plus interest as well?

1	MS. GRAHAM: Yes. One moment, your Honor?
2	(Pause)
3	THE COURT: This is a preliminary order, so at the
4	time of sentencing, I'm likely to impose a final order, and
5	that typically will include interest or certainly could include
6	interest, okay?
7	MS. GRAHAM: Yes, your Honor. The agreement doesn't
8	say anything about interest.
9	THE COURT: So, interest will be up to me, and,
10	typically, I will impose interest. That's generally what I do
11	unless there's a good reason not to. Okay?
12	THE DEFENDANT: Okay.
13	THE COURT: All right.
14	Mr. de Castro, are you aware of any defense that would
15	prevail as a matter of law or any other reason why Mr. Green
16	should not be allowed to plead guilty here today?
17	MR. de CASTRO: No, Judge.
18	THE COURT: So, Mr. Green, at this point, I'm going to
19	ask you to tell me in your own words you can stay seated
20	but tell me in your own words what it is you did that makes you
21	guilty of this crime.
22	THE DEFENDANT: In December, I went to Boston and
23	participated
24	THE COURT: Take your time. So, in December of 2000?
25	THE DEFENDANT: '14.

1	THE COURT: '14?
2	THE DEFENDANT: Yeah. I went to Boston and get
3	involved with a robbery.
4	THE COURT: Okay. And tell me a little bit about the
5	robbery.
6	THE DEFENDANT: A friend of mine called from
7	New York called me from Boston and asked me if I could drive
8	up. We rented a car. He didn't have a license, so we drove it
9	up there. When I got up there, the plan was to rob somebody.
10	And I didn't say no. I partic acted along with them.
11	THE COURT: So, you were with them?
12	THE DEFENDANT: Yeah.
13	THE COURT: Understanding that they were going to be
14	engaged in a robbery?
15	THE DEFENDANT: First, I didn't know until I got
16	there, but once I got there, I didn't say no to them.
17	THE COURT: You continued in the process?
18	THE DEFENDANT: I continued with it.
19	THE COURT: Okay. And you knew at that time
20	THE DEFENDANT: Yeah.
21	THE COURT: that what you were doing was wrong and
22	illegal?
23	THE DEFENDANT: I know at that time. I was just too
24	stupid to back out.
25	THE COURT: And who was being robbed?

2.2

THE DEFENDANT: It was a guy that drive around with money, I think.

THE COURT: Money in his truck?

THE DEFENDANT: Armored car.

THE COURT: An armored car.

Okay. So that probably covers the interstate commerce part of this, put Ms. Graham will talk about that.

Part of this plea agreement, I think, said that you were going to waive venue. Remember I said some part of the crime has to have taken place here in New York, in the Southern District of New York. It seems like most of this crime took place up in Boston, and that when you drove from New York to Boston, at least initially, you weren't aware of what the plan was. By the time you got to Boston or Massachusetts, you did understand, and you agreed to participate; is that right?

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, I didn't back down.

THE COURT: Yes. And then did you come back to New York at that point?

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, we drove back straight to New York.

THE COURT: With the money?

THE DEFENDANT: With the money.

THE COURT: Okay. So it may be there would be venue here anyway, but you've agreed to waive venue, so that even if that isn't sufficient for venue, you've agreed that that's not

a problem, and you consent being to prosecuted here rather than Massachusetts; is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. And there was some force used -- if not by you, at least by others -- in engaging in this robbery?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, force.

THE COURT: They used force, a gun, or a threat of gun or violence.

THE DEFENDANT: They went out with a gun and robbed.

THE COURT: Okay. So, that's enough to establish the force element of this crime.

Ms. Graham, is that a satisfactory allocution to your mind?

MS. GRAHAM: Yes, your Honor. We would just add a proffer that they robbed an employee of an ATM restocking business that affects interstate commerce.

THE COURT: Yes. Okay.

And, Mr. de Castro, is that a satisfactory allocution to your mind?

MR. de CASTRO: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. I think so, too. I think that covers all the elements as necessary.

So, at this point, I'm going to ask Ms. Graham just to very briefly summarize the elements of this crime -- excuse me,

to very briefly summarize the government's evidence in this case, what the government would show if the case went to trial.

Listen to her carefully, Mr. Green. If when she's finished, you disagree with something she said, let me know, and I will give you a chance to be heard on that. Okay?

THE DEFENDANT: Okay, your Honor.

THE COURT: Ms. Graham.

MS. GRAHAM: The evidence would include most critically the testimony of one of Mr. Green's coconspirators in the robbery, which would be corroborated by testimony from the victim of the robbery, surveillance video of parts of the robbery, as well as call detail records and cell site records from the phones that were used by the conspirators.

THE COURT: All right.

Do you have any questions or any disagreement with what Ms. Graham just said, Mr. Green?

MR. de CASTRO: Judge, I'm just repeating the last part of it.

THE COURT: Okay.

(Pause)

MR. de CASTRO: Thank you, Judge.

THE DEFENDANT: Sorry.

THE COURT: All right. So, you don't disagree with anything that Ms. Graham just said?

THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.

25

1	THE COURT: Okay.
2	So, let me now ask you to stand, Mr. Green. Oh, is
3	that
4	THE DEFENDANT: That's okay.
5	THE COURT: You're okay?
6	How do you now plead to Count Two of the indictment,
7	guilty or not guilty?
8	THE DEFENDANT: Guilty, your Honor.
9	THE COURT: Did you do the things you're charged with
10	doing in this indictment?
11	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I did.
12	THE COURT: Are you pleading guilty because you are
13	guilty?
14	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
15	THE COURT: Are you pleading guilty voluntarily and of
16	your own free will?
17	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
18	THE COURT: All right. Mr. Green, because you
19	acknowledge that you're guilty, because your plea is entered
20	knowingly and voluntarily, and is supported by an independent
21	basis in fact for each of the elements, because you know your
22	rights, and you've agreed to waive your rights, I accept your
23	guilty plea, and I find you guilty on Count Two of the
24	indictment. So, have a seat.

What we're going to do now is set a date for

sentencing. Normally, I would set a sentencing date about three or four months out. That's to allow the probation department to prepare a report that is very helpful to me in deciding what's an appropriate sentence. That report is referred to as a presentence report, or a PSR, and it's often quite lengthy, it might be 25 or 30 pages long, and it will include a lot of information, much more than I have now, information about you and your life, from your birth right up until now, about your work history, about your health, about your family circumstances. It will also have a lot more information about this crime. I've heard a little bit about this crime, but the presentence report generally includes a lot more detail. If there were victims involved, the victims will have a chance to be interviewed and be heard from. So, that will also be part of the report.

So, the way the report is really prepared is the probation officer interviews a lot of people. So, they'll interview your family members, they'll interview your employers, perhaps, they'll interview the victim, they'll interview the agents who worked on the case, and they'll also interview you.

THE DEFENDANT: Okay.

THE COURT: So, I assume, Mr. de Castro, you want to be present for any interview?

MR. de CASTRO: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: And, so, I'll direct that no interview should take place unless Mr. de Castro is there.

I don't think that will be a problem. I've never had a situation where probation jumps the gun and tries to interview somebody without their lawyer. But if that were to happen, you would just say, hey, my lawyer is not here, the Judge told me not to proceed without my lawyer. But once the interview starts -- Mr. de Castro is there and the interview starts -- I will expect then that you will be truthful and complete in all your answers to the probation officer. Okay?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: The probation officer works for me. They don't work for the government, they work for the Court. So, treat the probation officer with the same respect, the same courtesy that you would treat me with and that you have treated me with. Okay?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Because if you were to make any false statements to the probation officer, well, again, that would be a crime. It wouldn't be perjury, but it would be the crime of obstruction of justice, and it would carry consequences in this case, for the guidelines, so you could be separately prosecuted for obstruction of justice. You also would probably get more points under this book, and certain of the subtractions that might otherwise apply wouldn't apply, so that your numbers

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

would go up, and the range would be higher, and that's in no one's interests. I have no reason to think you're going to do that. I just want to make sure you're very careful and very thorough in all your answers to the probation officer, okay?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Once the probation officer has completed the report, he or she will send it to you and your lawyer, as well as the government. You should read it carefully, word for word, cover to cover. If there is anything in that report that you think is inaccurate, tell Mr. de Castro. He will then contact the probation officer to say, hey, we disagree with what you have here, here, and here. The probation officer -the government will have the same opportunity. The probation officer will then issue a final report. That final report will come to me. That's the first one I will see. I won't get the first one, I'll get the final report. You will also get a copy of the final report, so will the government. You, again, should read the final report cover to cover, word for word, don't assume that it's unchanged from the prior version, don't assume that your requests for changes were honored, they may not have been. So, it might be totally different, it might be very much the same. Don't assume anything. Read it carefully. If there are any portions that you think are inaccurate, tell Mr. de Castro. Whether you told him from the prior version or not, tell Mr. de Castro. At that point, he will make formal

objections to me if there's anything in there that he thinks is inaccurate. The government, again, will have the same opportunity.

If there are disputes about what's contained in the report, if there are objections, in other words, I will resolve them. We may have, like, a mini trial, maybe I'll hear from witnesses, maybe I'll review evidence, or it may be that I will just hear from the lawyers, it might be just arguments not so much about what the factors are, as much as what conclusions should be drawn from certain facts. So we'll see. Whatever the objections are, I will resolve them in the way that I think is appropriate. But I'll be very clear about what I'm doing. Okay?

THE DEFENDANT: Okay, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, in addition to that presentence report, I will also accept whatever submissions are made in connection with sentencing. So, I expect that Mr. de Castro will make a written submission on your behalf, telling me a little bit about you as a person, explaining why the different factors that I mentioned support a particular sentence. He's free to make a recommendation. The government will have the same opportunity.

Naturally, I will read those reports. They can be really valuable. Excuse me, those submissions. So I'll read the PSR from the probation department, I'll read the

submissions from the lawyers. If there's anybody else who wants to send me a letter, that's fine. That's very helpful, frankly. I mean, the probation officer will often have interviewed people, and so the statements of others close to you will often be reflected in the presentence report, but if you or anybody close to you wants to send me a letter to tell me more about you and more about what this case has meant to you, what impact it's had on you, that's fine. I will read those letters. They can be really helpful. They give me a lot more insight than I have. I don't know you well, right? I've seen you in court a couple of times, but I don't know you well. So, if others want to write letters, or if you yourself want to write a letter, you're very welcome to.

The only thing I would ask is that if you or others want to write me a letter before sentencing, have the letters sent to Mr. de Castro. He'll collect them all, he'll then attach them to his submission, and then send it to me. That way, I'll be confident that I got everything all at once, and I will be more confident that nothing has slipped through the cracks, okay?

Now, on the day of sentencing, we'll come back in here to court. At that point I will go over with you and the lawyers what I have received and reviewed in connection with sentencing. That way, if I've left something out, you can say, well, there was another letter, Judge, that you didn't mention,

and then we can correct it. So, I'll go over everything that I have reviewed and received.

I will then resolve any objections, if there are objections, to what's in the presentence report. I will then make my findings under the guidelines, and then at that point, I will hear from the lawyers. They're free to expand upon or elaborate on what they wrote in their submissions. They're free to respond to each other. They may respond to questions that I ask, but I'll certainly give them an opportunity to be heard here in court.

If there are victims who wish to be heard, they, too, will have an opportunity to be heard in court, they have a right to be heard, so I'll allow them that opportunity.

And, finally, I will give you an opportunity to speak, if you'd like. You're not required to, but you have a right to speak, and I'll certainly give you that opportunity, and I'd be happy to hear from you. Okay?

THE DEFENDANT: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, after all of that, then I will finally tell you the sentence that I intend to impose, I'll explain my reasons, I'll then check with the lawyers to make sure I haven't done something illegal or improper, and assuming not, then I will formally impose the sentence. So, that's the process. And it's going to take a little time, but do you have any questions about any of that?

1	THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.
2	THE COURT: So let's pick a date. What do we have,
3	Ari?
4	Is that okay, Friday, July 28th? Is everybody around
5	that day?
6	MS. GRAHAM: Yes, your Honor.
7	MR. de CASTRO: That's fine.
8	THE COURT: What time, afternoon or morning?
9	THE LAW CLERK: It looks like the afternoon is better.
10	THE COURT: 2:30? Is that okay?
11	MS. GRAHAM: That's fine, your Honor.
12	THE COURT: Is that all right?
13	Okay. If it's not a good time, we can do another
14	time, but often I do these on Fridays, just because I like to
15	have a block of time where I know I won't be interrupted. So,
16	Friday, July 28th, at 2:30.
17	Between now and then, you're going to remain in
18	custody. You'll get credit for the time that you're serving
19	that will count toward your sentence, I believe. Stay in touch
20	with Mr. de Castro. If that sentencing date changes for
21	whatever reason, he'll let you know. If between now and
22	July 28th, you think you need to see me for whatever reason,
23	let me know. You can tell Mr. de Castro, he'll set something
24	up, and we can then schedule something. Okay?
25	THE DEFENDANT: Thank you.

THE COURT: But my hunch is that there's a lot to do, 1 and so make sure that you're in touch with Mr. de Castro and 2 3 make sure that you're preparing for the sentencing because that will be a really important day, obviously. Okay? 4 5 THE DEFENDANT: Thanks. 6 THE COURT: Is there anything else we should discuss 7 today? 8 MS. GRAHAM: Nothing from the government, your Honor. 9 MR. de CASTRO: No, Judge. Thank you. 10 THE COURT: All right. 11 So, good luck to you, Mr. Green. I'll see you in a 12 few months. 13 Let me thank the court reporter. Let me thank the marshals as well. 14 15 And I guess the trial that was scheduled in this case, for May, I think it was -- or was it April -- anyway is now 16 17 adjourned, and so we'll just proceed with sentencing, as I 18 said. 19 Great. Okay, thank you. 20 MR. de CASTRO: Thank you. 21

THE COURT: Let me give this back to you, Ms. Graham.

Don't be shy, Ms. Graham. Put yourself on the docket sheet.

MS. GRAHAM: Yes, your Honor.

25

22

23

24